

missile defense that it seems like many times people overlook it. And what I hear, just talking to people back in my district they say, well, couldn't these bad guys basically smuggle a missile into our city and just set it off? And they don't really need a missile to do that. And the answer is, they can try, but that's not as easy to do as it appears because the bombs and things do emit some radiation and there's some chance we could catch them.

But the other main point is that a bomb set off up in the air is far, far more deadly, hundreds of times more deadly in terms of casualties than one set off on the ground. I think that's part of the reason why you see our opponents developing these ballistic and intercontinental ballistic missiles because of this high level of threat and a very rapid ability to deploy a weapon. And so that's part of the reason why this is a very key topic.

And I thank you so much. The gentleman from Arizona has taken a lot of time to understand this, knows it inside and out. He's just about like an expert. And Arizona has been doing the right thing sending you up here.

And I think we're going to move on to another topic which is particularly of importance to Americans today, and that's the subject of taxation and energy. Not so long ago, our President said, under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, or that is cap-and-tax system, electric rates would necessarily skyrocket. That will cost money. They will pass that money on to consumers. This is the President in a meeting in guilty January of 2008.

Well, he is now the President. And they're talking about this cap-and-tax system that's been the subject of debate now for hours and hours in the Energy and Commerce Committee. And from what we're seeing and taking a look at what's being proposed, the President was accurate in this statement. It is going to be extremely expensive, and electric rates are going to skyrocket indeed.

The interesting thing about this though was he stood here at the beginning of this year and said, I'm not going to tax anybody that's making less than \$250,000. And yet what's being proposed here is every time you turn a light switch on, you're going to get some more taxation.

How much taxation are we talking about? And what's the logic of this?

Well, the logic is supposed to be that the Earth is getting too hot, and that's really a serious problem for us. The Earth is getting too hot. And so I thought it was interesting to take a look back historically over the last hundred years, not at the temperature of the Earth, but at what the scientists have been saying down through the years.

In 1920, the newspapers were filled with scientific warnings of a fast approaching glacial age, 1920s.

1930s, scientists reversed themselves and they said there's going to be serious global warming in the 1930s.

In 1972, Time magazine, citing numerous scientific reports that imminent runaway glaciation is what the Time magazine called it. And by 1975, Newsweek, scientific evidence of an ice age. And so people were being called to stockpile food, and the question of whether we should use nuclear weapons or some method of melting the Arctic ice cap.

1976, U.S. government: "The Earth is heading into some sort of mini-ice age."

And now we've got global warming. And so over the period of the last hundred years, well-meaning scientists and, supposedly majorities of scientists, even, have changed their opinion about this global warming about three times or so.

Well, the complaint now is that we've got this CO₂ that's being generated which makes the Earth warmer and, therefore, we want to tax the CO₂. When the government wants to tax something, usually you'd better hang on to your wallet. We're talking about a lot of tax.

And tonight we have probably one of the most foremost experts in the House on the whole subject of this what's called cap-and-tax. A man who's been in the middle of these hearings for hours and hours is joining us. It's a treat to have Congressman SHIMKUS from Illinois. I yield time, gentleman.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Thank you. I appreciate the time. As stated, we're in the, in essence, the markup of the bill right now. And so I thought I'd just take a few minutes to talk about what happened yesterday and what's happening today.

The basic premise that we're trying to just remind the public that because to address this global warming you have to monetize carbon, that is, in essence, adding a dollar amount to carbon, which that dollar amount would be passed on. Ratepayers will pay more. President Obama admits it. Really, the draft bill admits it because there's 55 pages of what to do with job losses in the bill.

Here's a couple of amendments that we debated last week—I mean yesterday. An amendment offered by LEE TERRY, Republican, of Nebraska, would require annual EPA certification of the average retail price of gasoline. If the price exceeds \$5 per gallon as a result of this act, this act would cease to be effective.

We're admitting that there will be an increase in cost. Voted down on a party-line vote.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming, you're just saying that what we said is, hey, gas is painful when it gets up there to \$3 or \$4 a gallon. But you're saying if gas gets to \$5, we put an amendment saying enough already; that's enough tax at \$5 a gallon. And that was a party-line vote. The Republicans voting, I assume, that they don't want to let it get over 5. The Democrats saying it's okay to tax more than that; is that correct?

Mr. SHIMKUS. That is correct. Another amendment offered by our col-

league, MIKE ROGERS, Republican, from Michigan, that would require an annual certification by the administrator in consultation with the Department of State and the United States Trade Representative that China and India have adopted a mandatory greenhouse gas reduction program at least as stringent as that would be imposed under this act. And what we're saying is this is all pain and no gain unless we have an international agreement that brings in China and India.

Well, my colleagues on the other side all voted "no" against requiring China and India to be under the same regime. Republicans all voted that we should be in the same regime.

Another amendment that said if unemployment gets to 15 percent, that we ought to change course, that this cap-and-trade scheme is not working. Another party-line vote, Republicans saying we ought to get out of this agreement if job loss gets to 15 percent. Democrats stayed on the party line saying, no, 15 percent job loss is acceptable under this bill.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time for a minute. What—how much unemployment do we have now? We're not up to 10 percent yet, are we gentleman?

Mr. SHIMKUS. We are right around 10 percent.

Mr. AKIN. Right near 10. So you're saying if it gets to 15, enough already. We've got to ease back on this thing that's hurting us. Because the point of the matter is this tax is going to create unemployment. Right? And if they say, well, it's not going to create unemployment, then they don't have any problem with an amendment saying that at 15 percent unemployment we're going to stop it. Right?

But, no, so they're saying no we don't want that amendment, saying they think it will go over 15 percent.

Mr. SHIMKUS. And I am going to head back to the committee and I appreciate the time. Let me just say we also had an amendment: will global warming bills' costs be disclosed. We asked for full disclosure on electricity bills. Republicans said, yeah, that's a good idea. Democrats voted "no." Democrats declined to shield homeowners from electricity spike hikes.

So what we're trying to do is, understanding that this is going to cause an increased cost to the ratepayer, no one's speaking for the ratepayers. Well, the Republicans are speaking to the ratepayer. The Democrats in the committee markup are speaking to those special interest groups that cut this deal behind closed doors.

□ 2015

You've got a lot of my colleagues here who all want to speak with you. I appreciate your yielding me some time. Keep up the great fight.

Mr. AKIN. Congressman SHIMKUS is just doing the yeoman's job on the committee. It's a tough thing. Those amendments seem to me so common-sense that I'm kind of amazed that